

Many Opinions Already Formed by Reading Newspapers

JUDGE WATSON GOES SWIFTLY INTO TRIAL

(Continued from Page Eight.)

ing between the attorneys. It was agreed to let the matter go as statements on the records. But there was more argument as to when Mr. Smith appeared in the case.

"Then you will swear that I appeared before July 21?" he asked Mr. Wendenburg.

"I will swear that you appeared before the inquest," replied the other.

"There will be no dispute about the facts," the court interrupted again. "I cannot grant a postponement. Do you note an exception?"

"Yes."

"Note the exception," Mr. Stoenographer, said the court.

"Are there any further preliminary?" asked the court.

"Wanted to quash indictment."

Mr. Carter arose to object to the method by which the grand jury had been summoned, and said, "I move to quash the indictment." He was asked to specify grounds for the motion, but refused to do so.

"Do you not think it better to plead abatement, if there be no error upon the record?" asked the court.

"He should specify the error, and if there be grounds for the motion he ought to point them out."

The court has asked counsel for the defense to do so, but they are unable or unwilling to do so," replied Judge Watson. "The court requests that the defense show the error, and overrules the motion. As a matter of fact," continued Judge Watson, "the court has stated that it summoned this as a special grand jury. Are there any other motions, gentlemen?"

"No," came from the defense.

"Mr. Clerk, you may arraign the prisoner."

"Henry Clay Beattie, Jr., stand up," said Clerk Coghill.

The young man arose steadily, and without change of expression and averting his eyes only now and then to glance at those in front of him, stared hard at the clerk.

"The long indictment was read amid a painful silence in the courtroom.

The father of the prisoner sat still, with bowed head.

"Are you guilty or not guilty?" asked the clerk, as he finished reading the paper.

"Guilty," replied the accused steadily, as Mr. Smith raised his hand to interrupt him.

"I move to quash the indictment," the attorney said hurriedly. He argued that the venire facias for both the grand and petit juries had been improperly issued and served, and that the sheriff had committed an error thereon. But he failed to convince the court.

"The motion is overruled," said Judge Watson.

We want the names of all the witnesses summoned by the prosecution," said Mr. Smith. "We are entitled to that. The prosecution is not to be allowed to summon witnesses they have not named."

"There are any objection?" asked the court.

"We have none," replied Mr. Wendenburg, "but I deny it as a proposition of law."

Severe on Kidd.

"Not all the names of those summoned by the defense," said Mr. Smith. "Many of them have been summoned by the Commonwealth's attorney under a special statute."

"I know of no such law," replied Judge Watson.

"The court hopes the names will be given, so that the case may go on," urged Judge Watson.

"We have not shown any disposition not to give the names," said Mr. Wendenburg, "but now is the time to explain a few things to the court. We consented days ago to give names of witnesses to the other side. Since then an amateur detective named Kidd went to John Joseph, one of our witnesses, and took him to the jail to identify the prisoner as having been concerned in a certain transaction. He told Joseph that if he did identify Beattie he would be locked up. He was to swear that Beattie was not the man."

"I don't know anything about it," Mr. Smith interjected, "and I don't believe it."

"We ask for an attachment against this young man," continued Mr. Wendenburg, "to have him brought before you to show cause why he should not be punished for contempt of court."

"The matter is not before the court as a record," said Judge Watson, "and I cannot now take it up."

The prosecution intimated, however, that the alleged action of Kidd would be made a matter of record.

"We will give them the names of our witnesses as we come to them," said Mr. Wendenburg. "And we would like them to give us the names of their witnesses. Do you refuse?" he asked, turning to counsel for the defense.

"You have no right to ask it," replied Mr. Smith, "whereas we have

a right to make the demand of you."

Calling the Venire.

The discussion ended when the court turned and said: "Mr. Sheriff, call the venire."

"N. W. Farley," cried the clerk, "come forward." He continued the list of the first venire, for two were summoned in case of exigency. E. L. Wilson, A. L. Fetteroff, Irving M. Bass, Jr., W. W. Fuqua, W. M. Jackson, C. A. Wilkinson, A. T. Bardwell, J. H. Fry, Warren Morrisette, J. Ernest Goode, C. H. Duffer, W. H. Eanes, R. Cleveland Woodbridge. All are residents of Chesterfield county.

"Henry Clay Beattie, Jr.," said the clerk, addressing himself to the prisoner, "the jury to try you is about to be called. If you have objection to any of them, say so." Counsel nodded.

"N. W. Farley," called the clerk, in reply to the queries, the venireman stated that he lived two and one-half miles, this side of Petersburg, was born and raised in Chesterfield, was thirty-seven years old, and was a registered voter.

"How much do you read the newspapers?" asked the court.

"Every day. I followed the story carefully, and read up on it pretty good."

"Have the accounts caused you to form an opinion as to whether the prisoner is guilty or not?"

"According to the papers my opinion has been formed. Yes, sir."

"Your opinion, you say, has been formed. Is it based on the assumption that the accounts in the papers are true?"

"Yes, sir."

"Now pay attention to what I ask you," said the court. "Have you formed an opinion as to whether the accounts in the papers are true?"

"No, sir."

"Then your opinion is based on the assumption of the truth of the accounts?"

"Yes, sir."

Covers Every Ground.

"The law says that one must try by a fair and impartial jury," said the judge. "Would what you have read impair your judgment or influence you in deciding the case?"

"No, sir."

"The law," continued Judge Watson, "assumes that every man charged with a crime is innocent. Can you be guided by this presumption of law and not be influenced otherwise?"

"Yes, sir."

"Are you related by consanguinity or by other ties to the prisoner at the bar, or were you related in like manner to the deceased?"

"No, sir."

"Do you live more than three miles from any point in the Midlothian Turnpike on which the crime was committed?"

"Yes, sir."

"The punishment upon conviction of murder in the first degree is death. Have you any conscientious scruples against the infliction of such punishment?"

"No, sir."

"You said," continued the court, "that you followed the newspaper accounts of the crime closely. Is your opinion decided? Could you act upon the evidence to be brought before a jury and not be guided by a previous opinion?"

"Yes, sir. I would be guided only by the evidence."

The defense was satisfied, and the first man called from the venire was accepted. The case had started.

W. M. Jackson, second man called, stated that he lived four or five miles from Petersburg, and had lived all his life in the county. He is a registered voter, and was not related to Beattie or the deceased. He had no personal knowledge of the crime, and had not heard from others who claimed to know about it. He said he read the papers fairly well.

"Do you believe everything you see in the newspapers?" asked the court suddenly.

"No, sir, not everything," and a titter went around the courtroom.

"Have you formed a fixed opinion?"

"I might be biased by the papers."

"There are two sorts of opinions," said the court. "One is that opinion which is so fixed that one cannot get rid of it. That is a decided, or a fixed, opinion. On the other hand, you may assume certain things to be true, and base your opinion on that, changing it if you found that those things were

Beattie Trial Jurors.

The jurors, all but two of them, are farmers from the county. The two exceptions are a quarryman and a contractor. The names of the jurors are:

No. 1—N. W. Farley, quarryman, thirty-seven years old.

No. 2—R. H. Covington, thirty-three years old.

No. 3—John T. Dance, forty-eight years old.

No. 4—E. L. Wilson, thirty-eight years old.

No. 5—L. Fetteroff, contractor, thirty-four years old.

No. 6—Irving M. Bass, Jr., thirty years old.

No. 7—B. W. Fuqua, twenty-seven years old.

No. 8—W. L. Parsons, fifty-two years old.

No. 9—M. E. Purdie, twenty-seven years old.

No. 10—J. C. Conroy, fifty-three years old.

No. 11—W. T. Lundy, fifty-nine years old.

No. 12—H. C. Robinson, forty-four years old.

not true. That is called a hypothetical opinion."

"I object to that definition," interrupted Mr. Carter. "A decided opinion is not necessarily a fixed opinion."

"I will amend it," answered the court. "Is your opinion based on the assumption that the newspapers are correct in their accounts?" asked the court, again addressing himself to Mr. Jackson.

"Yes, sir."

"Do you think you would be biased in your jury verdict?"

"I think I would be."

"Stand aside."

R. Hill Covington was the third called. He is a voter, has lived all his life in Chesterfield, and is about twenty-five years old.

"Have you read the papers?" asked Judge Watson.

"I've read them very little," was the answer.

"Could you give the prisoner a fair trial?"

"Yes, sir."

"Have you formed no opinion?" asked Mr. Carter of the defense.

"No, sir. I haven't any."

Mr. Covington was accepted.

C. T. Wilkinson, next called, is not related to Beattie or the deceased, and had no personal knowledge of the crime. He had read the papers fairly closely.

"Have you formed an opinion as to the case?" he was asked.

"No, sir. Only one side of the case has been printed."

"Has anything in the papers caused you to form an opinion biased to the prisoner?"

"No, sir."

"Guided by Evidence.

"I think I would report myself so as to be influenced only by the evidence," replied Mr. Wilkinson.

"Have you any scruples as to the infliction of death as a penalty prescribed by law?"

"The law prescribes the punishment, and I must support the law," came as the steady reply.

"You have no fixed opinion?" asked Mr. Carter.

"No, sir. My mind would be guided only by the evidence."

John T. Dance was called.

There was a little noise in the courtroom as Mr. Dance stepped forward.

"Sheriff, keep the courtroom quiet," ordered Judge Watson.

"Stop that talking," said the sheriff, half rising from his seat at the foot of the bench. "They seem only to be scuffling a little," he said, turning to the court.

Mr. Dance laughed a little, and another murmur passed through the room. But it was quiet again within a moment.

Dance was not related to either the prisoner or his dead wife, had formed no opinion, was not prejudiced against the prisoner and could give him a fair trial. He had lived nearly all his life in Chesterfield county, and is about fifty years old. He said he would not be deterred in rendering a decision by the fact that the extreme penalty for first degree murder is death.

"Are you absolutely unprejudiced?" asked Mr. Smith, of the defense.

"Yes, sir."

Mr. Dance was accepted.

"Wait a moment," requested the court. "I forgot to ask Mr. Wilkinson a question. Mr. Wilkinson, are you a citizen of Chesterfield county?"

"Yes, sir."

"How long have you lived here?"

"Only about two months. I moved from here to Lynchburg, and then moved back."

"Have you a vote here?"

"No, sir."

"Have you a vote in Lynchburg?"

"Yes, sir," and the venireman explained that he had received his transfer, owing to circumstances over which he had no control. He was excused.

Formed No Opinion.

T. L. Wilson was then called. After he had answered the usual preliminary questions he was asked if he had read the papers.

"I don't read the papers much," he replied. "I can read," he explained, thinking it might be considered that he didn't read much because he couldn't read well. "I haven't much faith in newspapers," he went on. "I read about the crime of the murder, and did not read the papers every day."

"Have you formed an opinion?"

"No, sir. I couldn't. I don't believe much in the papers. I can give a fair trial."

The defense did not question him, and was accepted.

"A. F. Bardwell," called the clerk. Mr. Bardwell has lived in Chesterfield twelve years, and is a registered voter. He was not related to prisoner or his dead wife. He said he read the papers every day.

"Have they caused you to form an opinion?" he was asked.

"They have given me a pretty good way to make me form an opinion," he answered.

"Could you give the prisoner a fair trial?" asked Mr. Wendenburg.

"Yes, sir. I think I could give him a square deal."

But he added that it would take pretty strong evidence to make him change his opinion. He was ordered to stand aside for the time being.

A. L. Fetteroff said he had read nearly all the accounts of the crime. But the papers had had no effect in making him form an opinion, and he had formed none. The papers were one-sided, he said. He has been in Chesterfield twenty-two years, and is a voter. No questions were asked by the defense, and he was accepted.

Then came J. H. Fry. He has lived in Chesterfield twenty-two years, but is not a voter, having not voted for

eight years. He said he was qualified to vote, but was not a registered voter. He was ordered to stand aside, and the suffrage question as to its effect on the eligibility of jurors was discussed briefly, and it was decided to take the matter of Fry and Wilkinson up later.

We will except in either case," announced Mr. Smith, "whether they are accepted or rejected."

Two Quickly Excused.

Warren Morrisette was excused because it was feared that he would not be able to stand the ordeal of a possibly long trial. He has been suffering from asthma.

J. Ernest Goode was rejected because he had read the prisoner guilty, and his opinion was too fixed.

Irving M. Bass, Jr., qualified, as he had read little in the papers, and had expressed no opinion and had no scruples against the extreme penalty demanded by law. The defense did not question him, and he was accepted.

B. W. Fuqua had not expressed an opinion, and could give a fair trial on the legal presumption of the innocence of the prisoner. He was accepted.

C. H. Duffer claimed exemption on account of his age. He is sixty-nine years old.

W. H. Eanes was called.

"How old are you?" inquired the court.

"Sixty-three years."

"Do you claim exemption?"

"No, sir."

"Are you healthy?"

"Yes, sir. I'm pretty strong and healthy. I haven't had doctor for years." He had expressed an opinion from what he had read in the newspapers, but did not believe all he read in them. He said the papers had conflicting accounts.

"What papers do you read?" asked the court.

"The Times-Dispatch and the Journal," he replied. He said he believed the prisoner was guilty, and it would take strong evidence to make him change his mind. He didn't know whether he could act on the presumption that every man is innocent. He was qualified to stand aside for a time, Judge Watson said, and would like to look up a decision of the Supreme Court in the McCue trial as to the eligibility of a man situated like Mr. Eanes.

R. C. Woodbridge, twenty-six years old, is not a voter, and was asked to stand aside temporarily. If the defense wishes, it may argue now on the suffrage question as it relates to the eligibility of jurors."

"We move to quash and discharge this venire. We move to quash the venire facias summoning a petit jury and the sheriff's return thereon," said Mr. Carter.

But the defense refused to stand upon what grounds the motion was made, or to point out the error it alleged, and the motion was overruled.

"Do you except to the three men set aside?" the defense was asked.

"We will except in either case," replied Mr. Smith, "whether they are accepted or rejected."

Mr. Wendenburg arose to ask that the prosecution be allowed a ten-minute conference, and as it was within that time of the adjourning hour—1 o'clock—it was decided to adjourn until 2 o'clock.

Before adjourning Judge Watson addressed these petit jurors who had been accepted.

"You have been accepted in this case," he said to them, "and you must be exceedingly careful not to talk with any one concerning it, and not permit any one to talk with you. If you should discuss the case with outsiders and it should be discovered afterwards, the defense could except, and your verdict would be null and void, and the case would be greatly delayed. Don't let a human being talk to you about the case. Return to court at 2 o'clock."

After diving deep into many law books during the noon recess, Attorney Wendenburg argued as to the eligibility of the three veniremen, C. P. Wilkinson, J. H. Fry and R. Cleveland Woodbridge, who were not qualified voters, although otherwise citizens of the State and not otherwise disqualified from voting save from the fact that they had not registered.

Judge Watson after consideration of the points involved ruled that Mr. Woodbridge was clearly ineligible, not having lived in the county for twelve months previous to having been summoned. Mr. Carter, for the defense, was non-committal, for he would not state whether the defense wanted the questionable jurors admitted to the panel or excluded, but was frank enough to say that he proposed to note an exception in either case. The same objection was then applied to Mr. Fry. Mr. Wilkinson was examined, and after telling of having moved for a time to Lynchburg and then back to Chesterfield, he was also declared ineligible.

The first venire of sixteen men had then been called with the result that seven jurors were in the box, as follows: N. W. Farley, R. Henry Covington, John T. Dance, E. L. Wilson, A. L. Fetteroff, Irving M. Bass, Jr., and W. W. Fuqua. Mr. Farley is a quarryman by trade, Mr. Fetteroff is a quarryman and builder, and the others are farmers from the section of the county lying nearest to Petersburg, and therefore far from the scene of the crime.

Although another venire was already in attendance on the court for the trial of the general cases of the term, the members of which were eligible to be examined for jury service, on advice of attorneys for the Commonwealth a recess was taken while Clerk Coghill read in formal writ for a second venire, the members of which were already in attendance on the court. Twenty men answered to their names when Sheriff Gill called the roll, and again the tedious proceeding of examining each individual went on through the warm afternoon until almost night.

E. A. Belcher, forty-two years old, had read the Times-Dispatch daily since the crime, and had formed an opinion. He believed the substance of what he had read to be a correct and true account of the murder, and had expressed his opinion of the case several times. He was excused.

W. S. Clarke, aged fifty-five, had read a little of the case, but thought he could give a fair trial. It would be a matter of evidence to change the opinion he had already formed, however, and he was allowed to stand aside after a prolonged cross-examination as to the extent the impressions on his mind were in reality fixed opinions. O. W. Cox, aged fifty-two, had read every word of the case, and was promptly rejected as ineligible. P. J. Wilkinson, aged thirty-eight, had read the papers and had a fixed opinion which it would take material evidence to change. He was excused. T. J. Partin, aged forty-two years, had formed an opinion from newspaper accounts, and had so expressed himself, and was allowed to stand aside.

One Juror Secured.

W. L. Burgess proved the first addition to the jury at the afternoon session. He is fifty-two years of age, and has read newspapers, but his opinion was not such that evidence could not alter it. He believed he could give a trial as though he had never seen the papers, as the newspapers for which he subscribes, he stated, had printed but one side. He was accepted as a juror, though attorneys for the defense noted an ex-

ception, since the venireman had admitted that it would require testimony to change his opinion.

R. R. Gregory, fifty-five years of age, had read accounts every day and had a fixed opinion that the accounts he had read were true. He was allowed to stand aside. J. Connet, aged fifty-five, had read the paper closely, but "only took just so much stock" in what he had read. He had formed an opinion provided what he had seen in the papers was correct. He admitted the opinion would remain in his mind until removed by testimony, and that if the testimony should prove on oath to be as represented in the newspapers, his mind was already made up on the case. The court held that under the rule laid down by the Court of Appeals in the McCue case, the juror was a competent witness, but it did not appear that any such exigency had been reached as would justify the court in accepting as a juror any one who had formed such an opinion, so he would ask the witness to stand aside.

Promoting Exceptions.

Nelson E. Purdie, aged twenty-seven, was accepted as juror No. 9, to which Mr. Carter excepted, as the witness had formed a certain tentative opinion in the case based on what he had read in newspapers.

Mr. Purdie had read of the crime and formed an opinion that much of what he read must be true. He was afraid that his mind might be biased, and was allowed to stand aside. C. F. Ellett stated that he was ill and was excused on that account.

J. C. Conroy, aged fifty-three, filed the tenth seat in the jury box. He is a farmer and had read a "few sketches" from newspapers, receiving no lasting impression. He could give a fair and impartial trial he thought. He subscribed to no newspaper, and had not read any since the murder. He was closely cross-examined by Attorney Smith, and made to give a list of his neighbors and their addresses. In the course of which examination he admitted that most of what he had read of the case was from newspapers, but that few copies of the packages that had come into his hands.

Many Are Excused.

W. W. Crutchfield had read of the case and formed an opinion, and was promptly excused. L. C. Cosby seemed in some respects an available juror, although he had talked with neighbors about the case. It appeared that his health was not strong, however, and he was excused. R. S. Monro pleaded his exemption as more than sixty years of age, and was honorably discharged by the court with reference to his long service to the county in other connections. E. L. Gates, forty-eight years old, had read accounts closely and formed his opinion, and was excused.

C. T. Jenley was sixty years of age, but waived his exemption. He was found to have an opinion on the case, however, and was allowed to stand aside. W. J. Lundy, aged fifty-nine, said that while he had read of the case he had formed an opinion, remarking that the accused was a poor fellow, and that it was a time to lay aside prejudice when entering the jury box. He had expressed opinions to members of his family, based on what he had read in Petersburg papers, subject to the condition that the facts stated in the paper were true. He was accepted as the eleventh juror, though another exception was noted by the defense.

Horace C. Robinson, aged forty-four, had read but little, subscribing to no paper, and having seen but few copies since the killing. He didn't think what he had seen would bias his mind, remarking that "newspaper gossip was of no effect." He was accepted without objection. J. J. Cheatham, the last member of the second venire, had followed the newspapers fully and formed an opinion, and was allowed to stand aside.

Twelve Jurors Secured.

Having then examined thirty-six men the court had passed twelve possible jurors, still lacking the necessary panel of sixteen required, from which the defense has the right to strike four without cause, the court determined that it was not practicable to complete the panel from the by-standers, and after a conference among attorneys, an adjournment to Wednesday at 12 o'clock was agreed upon. Sheriff Gill was asked to summon a third venire, this time of thirty men. Judge Watson said he had no desire to overwork the sheriff in the matter, and it would take time to summon thirty men from widely separated points in the county, and he had never known the sheriff to be behind time or to fail to get any one sent for. Mr. Gill was sure he could get any thirty men in the county within twenty-four hours, and he followed that that he knew of no provision of law for keeping the venire together before the jury was sworn, and the twelve possible jurors were allowed to go to their homes with an earnest warning from the judge.

Waiting to Jurors.

"The court has found you," said Judge Watson, addressing the jurors, "free of exception and qualified to sit perhaps as jurors in this trial. It is not my purpose to keep you together in the custody of the sheriff, and you are adjourned to Wednesday at 12 noon. I caution you not to talk to one another about this case, or to permit any one else to talk to you, or to talk in your presence about it, or to read anything in any newspaper, or in any way bearing on the case, until you return to this court. It is a matter of first importance, and I shall ask you on your return whether you have read or heard anything about this case or whether you have discussed it in any way one with another."

On the suggestion of Commonwealth's Attorney Gregory that most of Wednesday afternoon would be taken in examining the new venire and completing the jury panel, the witnesses for the Commonwealth were called and excused to Thursday morning at 10 o'clock, when the trial proper will begin.

Defense Opens Saturday.

Mr. Wendenburg asserted that many of the witnesses called by the prosecution would not be used in rebuttal, and that but a brief time would be taken in making out the State's main case. Witnesses for the defense were therefore summoned to be in court on Saturday morning. Mr. Smith did not believe that the case would be turned over to the defense until well past the hour of precaution Judge Watson advised that the defense be ready to go ahead on Saturday.

The question of the disposition of the prisoner, Henry Clay Beattie, Jr., was then raised. Provision had been made for his safekeeping at Chesterfield Court House, where his cell was ready. Mr. Smith said that the attorneys for the defense wished to consult him as to many details of the case to-day, and that it would be a courtesy to them were he returned to the Henric Jail, where he has been kept since the coroner's inquest.

Judge Watson called on Special Agent L. H. Scherer, and on his statement that he was a sworn officer of the law, the prisoner was turned over to him for transmission to the Henric County Jail, where he was later delivered to the custody of Sheriff L. H. Kemp, to be produced at Chesterfield Courthouse to-morrow afternoon, when the examination of new veniremen will be resumed. The prisoner was hurried back to the city in a motor car surrounded by county, city and special officers.

Five Farmers Added.

The result of the afternoon session added to the seven men accepted in the morning five farmers, all coming from the southwestern section of the county, and from miles from the scene of the homicide. They are W. L. Burgess, N. E. Purdie, J. C. Conroy, Horace C. Robinson and W. L. Lundy. The monotony of the afternoon session was unrelieved by any incident. One venireman after another was subjected to the questioning of the court. To the onlooker it seemed that the defense was a little more strict than it had been in the morning in drawing distinctions between mere tentative views based on hearsay, and fixed opinions. It was noticed that while in the morning seven jurors had been selected from a venire of sixteen, in the afternoon five were chosen from a venire of twenty. In order that there might be no further delay, Judge Watson thought it best to summon not less than thirty in the third venire. These were summoned from a venire of four remaining seats in the panel, and were filled from this venire, and that no reason will appear for going outside of the county in which the murder was done to secure a jury.

ROWLAND SYDNOR APPEARS NOW AS LEADING WITNESS FOR THE DEFENSE

(Continued from First Page.)

up its sleeve which in itself has helped to carry Henry Beattie through the trying strain of the past month has been frequently hinted. Attorneys Smith and Carter are silent when asked what some of their witnesses are expected to prove. Some of the names have never before been mentioned in connection with the case, as for instance, Blacksmith Gibbs, of Swampboro; L. W. Cheatham, of South Richmond; former City Sergeant of Manchester John G. Saunders and others. Many of the friends of young Beattie are named, as for instance, C. Burley Anderson, of Cowardin Avenue, Sidney, Wilborn, of South Richmond; W. H. Sampson, of 1100 Porter Street; R. S. Robertson, of the Merchants and Mechanics' Bank, and others.

Defense Springs Surprise.

The surprising name on the list furnished by the defense is that of Rowland Sydnor, Chesterfield daylirman, living on the Midlothian Turnpike, whose evidence was popularly believed to be a material link in the chain of the prosecution. Yet his name appears among the list of those called for the defense, and the belief is strong that his testimony may prove something of a surprise, not only to the public, but to the prosecution itself.

In the list furnished by Attorney Smith there does not appear the name of any insanity witnesses, nor were there any experts in the list of those called by the State. The defense is known to have carefully canvassed the list of the Beattie family and consulted experts in considering their insanity plea. The Commonwealth candidly admits that it has notified the superintendents of two State hospitals for the insane that they may be needed as expert witnesses should the plea of insanity be offered.

Both sides are apparently playing for position in the matter of witnesses. It is not believed that either has shown its full hand. In fact, it came out in court yesterday that Commonwealth's Attorney Gregory had personally seen a certain people and asked them to be in court should they be needed, though the record does not show that they have been formally called. Likewise the defense is believed to be holding back part of its hand. It will have other witnesses either where they can be summoned readily or else in actual attendance on the court as a result of the request of attorneys, waiting the formal service of summons by the sheriff of the court.

Witnesses for State in Beattie Case

T. P. Pettigrew, W. J. Brown, Thomas E. Owen, Mrs. Paul Beattie, Beulah Hinford, Mrs. E. J. Paul Beattie, Thomas J. Wren, E. J. Houchens, J. L. Whitshire, Luther L. Scherer, G. T. Robertson, W. H. Flynn, Dr. J. G. Loving, A. G. Franklin, Jr., Dr. Wilbur Mercer, Jeff Morrisette, Henrietta Pittman, James D. Patton, Mamie Shaffer, Dr. Herbert Mann, Samuel Talley, May Stuart, E. Cousins, Marie Haynes, Mr. Farley, James Thomas, Mr. Wills, Mrs. Elliott, T. W. Mills, W. H. Sampson, W. O. McEvoy, B. S. Powers, John Butten, Mrs. H. S. Powers, W. B. Kidd, E. Moody, E. Burdick, Brown, Mrs. Cobb, James Green, J. J. Pace, C. G. Whitmore, Frank Mason, John Joseph, Jim Cunningham, Marie Wren, John Sandifer, E. J. Connet, John Randolph, W. A. Jacob, John Randolph, W. F. Britt, Linwood Bolton.

the suffrage question as it relates to the eligibility of jurors."

"We move to quash and discharge this venire. We move to quash the venire facias summoning a petit jury and the sheriff's return thereon," said Mr. Carter.

But the defense refused to stand upon what grounds the motion was made, or to point out the error it alleged, and the motion was overruled.

"Do you except to the three men set aside?" the defense was asked.

"We will except in either case," replied Mr. Smith, "whether they are accepted or rejected."

Mr. Wendenburg arose to ask that the prosecution be allowed a ten-minute conference, and as it was within that time of the adjourning hour—1 o'clock—it was decided to adjourn until 2 o'clock.

Before adjourning Judge Watson addressed these petit jurors who had been accepted.

"You have been accepted in this case," he said to them, "and you must be exceedingly careful not to talk with any one concerning it, and not permit any one to talk with you. If you should discuss the case with outsiders and it should be discovered afterwards, the defense could except, and your verdict would be null and void, and the case would be greatly delayed. Don't let a human being talk to you about the case. Return to court at 2 o'clock."

After diving deep into many law books during the noon recess, Attorney Wendenburg argued as to the eligibility of the three veniremen, C. P. Wilkinson, J. H. Fry and R. Cleveland Woodbridge, who were not qualified voters, although otherwise citizens of the State and not otherwise disqualified from voting save from the fact that they had not registered.

Judge Watson after consideration of the points involved ruled that Mr. Woodbridge was clearly ineligible, not having lived in the county for twelve months previous to having been summoned. Mr. Carter, for the defense, was non-committal, for he would not state whether the defense wanted the questionable jurors admitted to the panel or excluded, but was frank enough to say that he proposed to note an exception in either case. The same objection was then applied to Mr. Fry. Mr. Wilkinson was examined, and after telling of having moved for a time to Lynchburg and then back to Chesterfield, he was also declared ineligible.

The first venire of sixteen men had then been called with the result that seven jurors were in the box, as follows: N. W. Farley, R. Henry Covington, John T. Dance, E. L. Wilson, A. L. Fetteroff, Irving M. Bass, Jr., and W. W. Fuqua. Mr. Farley is a quarryman by trade, Mr. Fetteroff is a quarryman and builder, and the others are farmers from the section of the county lying nearest to Petersburg, and therefore far from the scene of the crime.

Although another venire was already in attendance on the court for the trial of the general cases of the term, the members of which were eligible to be examined for jury service, on advice of attorneys for the Commonwealth a recess was taken while Clerk Coghill read in formal writ for a second venire, the members of which were already in attendance on the court. Twenty men answered to their names when Sheriff Gill called the roll, and again the tedious proceeding of examining each individual went on through the warm afternoon until almost night.

E. A. Belcher, forty-two years old, had read the Times-Dispatch daily since the crime, and had formed an opinion. He believed the substance of what he had read to be a correct and true account of the murder, and had expressed his opinion of the case several times. He was excused.

W. S. Clarke, aged fifty-five, had read a little of the case, but thought he could give a fair trial. It would be a matter of evidence to change the opinion he had already formed, however, and he was allowed to stand aside after a prolonged cross-examination as to the extent the impressions on his mind were in reality fixed opinions. O. W. Cox, aged fifty-two, had read every word of the case, and was promptly rejected as ineligible. P. J. Wilkinson, aged thirty-eight, had read the papers and had a fixed opinion which it would take material evidence to change. He was excused. T. J. Partin, aged forty-two years, had formed an opinion from newspaper accounts, and had so expressed himself, and was allowed to stand aside.

One Juror Secured.

W. L. Burgess proved the first addition to the jury at the afternoon session. He is fifty-two years of age, and has read newspapers, but his opinion was not such that evidence could not alter it. He believed he could give a trial as though he had never seen the papers, as the newspapers for which he subscribes, he stated, had printed but one side. He was accepted as a juror, though attorneys for the defense noted an ex-

ception, since the venireman had admitted that it would require testimony to change his opinion.

R. R. Gregory, fifty-five years of age, had read accounts every day and had a fixed opinion that the accounts he had read were true. He was allowed to stand aside. J. Connet, aged fifty-five, had read the paper closely, but "only took just so much stock" in what he had read. He had formed an opinion provided what he had seen in the papers was correct. He admitted the opinion would remain in his mind until removed by testimony, and that if the testimony should prove on oath to be as represented in the newspapers, his mind was already made up on the case. The court held that under the rule laid down by the Court of Appeals in the McCue case, the juror was a competent witness, but it did not appear that any such exigency had been reached as would justify the court in accepting as a juror any one who had formed such an opinion, so he would ask the witness to stand aside.

Promoting Exceptions.

Nelson E. Purdie, aged twenty-seven, was accepted as juror No. 9, to which Mr. Carter excepted, as the witness had formed a certain tentative opinion in the case based on what he had read in newspapers.

Mr. Purdie had read of the crime and formed an opinion that much of what he read must be true. He was afraid that his mind might be biased, and was allowed to stand aside. C. F. Ellett stated that he was ill and was excused on that account.

J. C. Conroy, aged fifty-three, filed the tenth seat in the jury box. He is a farmer and had read a "few sketches" from newspapers, receiving no lasting impression. He could give a fair and impartial trial he thought. He subscribed to no newspaper, and had not read any since the murder. He was closely cross-examined by Attorney Smith, and made to give a list of his neighbors and their addresses. In the course of which examination he admitted that most of what he had read of the case was from newspapers, but that few copies of the packages that had come into his hands.

Many Are Excused.

W. W. Crutchfield had read of the case and formed an opinion, and was promptly excused. L. C. Cosby seemed in some respects an available juror, although he had talked with neighbors about the case. It appeared that his health was not strong, however, and he was excused. R. S. Monro pleaded his exemption as more than sixty years of age, and was honorably discharged by the court with reference to his long service to the county in other connections. E. L. Gates, forty-eight years old, had read accounts closely and formed his opinion, and was excused.

C. T. Jenley was sixty years of age, but waived his exemption. He was found to have an opinion on the case, however, and was allowed to stand aside. W. J